

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
FEBRUARY 14, 2012
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hulbert called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm

Ms. Kattreh introduced Susan Faus, new Manager of Edinborough Park to the Park Board. Ms. Faus gave the Park Board a brief background of herself.

II. WELCOME NEW PARK BOARD MEMBERS

Chair Hulbert welcomed the three new Park Board members: Cathy Cella, Dan Gieseke and Kathryn Peterson

III. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Dan Peterson, Segreto, Cella, Deeds, Hulbert, Gieseke, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson.

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Peterson, Segreto, Cella, Deeds, Hulbert, Gieseke, Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson.
Motion carried.

V. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, approving the consent agenda with the exception of item V.B., Approval of Minutes - Special Meeting of Monday, January 23, 2012

V. A. Approval of minutes – Regular meeting of Tuesday, January 10, 2012

~~V. B. Approval of minutes – Special meeting of Monday, January 23, 2012~~

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

V.B. SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 23, 2012 – APPROVED AS AMENDED

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Chair Hulbert, correcting the special meeting minutes of January 23, 2012, page two, paragraph four middle after “make Edina a better place”, to add:

“Member Jones indicated our goals are stated in the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 9, page 45.

They are: 1. For each of Edina’s enterprise facilities, provide recreational opportunities that are accessible and affordable to primarily, but not exclusively, Edina residents and yet remain competitively priced in the Twin Cities area. 2. Provide fee-based revenue generating recreation

enterprise facilities that collectively cover all facility and program expenses, including capital improvements, land purchase and all operating expenses.”

Top of page five, add new paragraphs following “Mr. Anderson replied that is correct”: “Member Jones asked how the high school players will access the other two non-adjacent rinks. Mr. Anderson replied through a tunnel

system and projected a diagram of a path running from the proposed new building along the outer east side of the West rink. Member Jones asked if construction costs for this tunnel were included

in the construction costs included in the packet. Mr. Anderson replied yes, they were included.”

Next paragraph: “Member Jones asked if the large hallway running north to south along the

proposed new building was designed especially wide so that it would accommodate a Zamboni to exit the stadium and an ambulance to enter the stadium. Mr. Anderson replied yes, that the interior hall will be wide enough to allow an ambulance and the Zamboni to travel past the locker room entrances and access the rink.”

Ayes: Peterson, Segreto, Cella, Deeds, Hulbert, Gieseke, Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson.
Motion carried.

VI. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VII. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VII.A. Hornet’s Nest at Braemar Arena

Chair Hulbert asked how the scale of the facility compares to other locker rooms. Eric Anderson, 6501 Indian Hills Rd., replied the scale of the facility when they are looking at the locker rooms themselves are approximately 62’ by 50’. He stated when you look at other locker rooms such as Minnetonka and Wayzata they are comparable in size; however, the shower facilities are a little bit larger than you would see in other facilities.

Member Segreto indicated that she was struck by the participation of school districts, whether a public or private arena. She wondered whether or not they could reopen the dialog and maybe Member Cella could help them with that. She asked how they could explore maybe on another level what the School Board might do for them in terms of participating in the arena project. Member Cella replied that would need to come through the School’s Committee structure, it would need to go to finance and facilities first. She pointed out that last year the School Board cut 2.5 million dollars from its budget and this year they will be looking to make more adjustments to their budget cutting maybe upwards of another half a million dollars. She explained that spending money to improve locker rooms coming out of their athletic budget is something that would have to be put in the hopper and considered with all of the other cuts that they are making to add something like that into the budget. Member Segreto commented that in light of the project that zero participation from the School Board is hard for her to fathom.

Member Jones noted they are being asked to approve this concept and asked what exactly does that mean. Member Deeds commented that he also is not exactly sure what they are voting on and asked Mr. Keprios what he sees as an affirmative vote entailing and authorizing. Mr. Keprios responded that he thinks this group has worked awfully hard for several months whose first priority is to get permanent locker rooms that meet Edina standards for varsity and junior varsity hockey teams. He noted they have found what they believe to be a very creative way to finance it. He added that Ms. Miller has done an excellent job of showing the numbers in the dry land training facility and that even if the locker rooms don’t happen this is something that should be on our radar screen. He stated that he thinks what is in front of you is do you agree with that particular concept, do you agree with its location. Also, are there parts of it that are troubling and not acceptable and you maybe want to pursue a different approach. Mr. Keprios stated that the Park Board may wish to pursue just the two main components; the locker room and training facility and find a way to get this done and keep it moving forward. He noted whatever issues you may have found whatever needs to be done, explore it and further study it so that this group can hopefully respond to whatever demands you want to place on them to move this forward to the City Council.

Chair Hulbert indicated when you look at the Hornet’s Nest proposal there are four main elements: locker rooms for varsity and junior varsity hockey teams, dry land training facility, food service and retail. He stated that he thinks an element that needs to be added is that they would be doing the arena a disservice if they ignore the south end of the west arena. He commented that instead of saying they approve the concept of the Hornet’s Nest, what if they were to say they approve the concept of expanded

lockers rooms with potential new revenue sources. Maybe move it to the next step and just study it and bring in proponents from the Hornet's Nest and maybe someone from the School District because he thinks it would be a missed opportunity not to explore this further.

Member Jones commented that this is not the first time she has struggled with the concept of looking at each of the enterprises separately. She noted she is afraid if they keep going down these paths of trying to figure out what is the best way to improve each one singularly because they may be making some changes down the road that they don't know they are making right now. The City does not have unlimited finances and by suggesting that they should look at this in a silo and say what are the needs of the arena without thinking about what do we need at Edinborough, what do we need for a dome, what do we need for Centennial Lakes and then separate from that is what is our mission, is part of our mission to provide locker rooms for the school. Where do all of these play out, what are the total needs of the community and see where each of the needs fit in. Member Jones indicated that she thinks this is the type of discussion she would like to have at their workshop with the City Council on March 13th and find out from them how they could advise them to their next step in pursuing all of the different enterprise and non-enterprise Park Board needs.

Member Segreto indicated that this group has spent a lot of time on this and there is no question in her mind that locker rooms are really embarrassing and something needs to be done with them. She stated that she is also convinced that a dry land training facility is in order; however, she is concerned about the risk as far as the restaurant services and retail. She commented that she likes the idea of making good with the momentum that they already have and would like to work together with this group and with the School District to at least examine the option of going forward and getting the locker rooms and dry land training facility done. Members Jones replied she is not saying she is against the project. It's just hard to know what the priority is of the City as to this project versus any of the other needs.

Member Steel informed the Park Board that at the User Fee Working Group meeting that was held on Sunday night they met with the athletic associations. She noted that Mr. Keprios requested that each of the athletic associations bring forward their requests for projects and what they would benefit from and sort of see what their needs are compared to this just so they sort of have an idea moving forward of what requests will be coming in. Mr. Keprios indicated if they delay this decision until all of the other issues that are currently on the City Council's plate are decided on it's going to be a long time and feels that what is in front of you ought to be dealt with on a case by case basis. He commented that you should deal with it as you feel it fits the plan for Edina rather than pit against another project and decide which one is a higher priority but rather judge it on its own merit and how important it is to have this at Braemar Arena. How do you feel it fits and is it worth what it's going to cost or is there a different way to do this and not delay it until other things are studied because you will be waiting a long time.

Member Deeds indicated that the group has done good work and the need is obvious; however, the need for Braemar is more than just locker rooms and one of his concerns with the plan as it stands is that it solves the high school locker room problem but it doesn't solve the Braemar locker room problem. It's dedicated space to the high school teams' locker rooms and there are a lot of other hockey teams and leagues and those locker rooms don't solve the larger locker room problem. He noted that he realizes that was not the group's focus and he is not faulting them on it but as they begin to look at Braemar and what's necessary to bring it up to date as it is with a lot of their other facilities and it's an interesting question. He noted that he doesn't want to lose momentum so he is in support of finding a way to keep it going and moving forward but he doesn't want wording that says "I approve the concept" right now but rather move it forward, keep working on it and get the Park Board's input on it because he doesn't want to lose any time on this because those facilities are atrocious but the fact that they need better locker rooms for everyone who uses that arena is something they need to consider. Member Deeds noted that he does agree that we as a city do not have a plan as to what we are doing with our amenities

and while they can't put everything on hold until they figure that out they better start figuring that out. He pointed out that if they look at a lot of the facilities it seems like for a decade or more they have underfunded on maintenance, the Parks Department have done the best they can and have done a wonderful job but if they think they are going to stay current and be competitive and the kind of city that we want Edina to be they have simply underfunded the amenities in this city. What was once leading edge of facilities in this state is no longer and that requires the City and the School District to step up and take a look at these issues. He indicated that he is willing to support moving this proposal forward but he is not willing to say he is supporting the concept yet, because he has not seen alternatives to the concept and he's not sure it solves all of the problems that this city has.

Chair Hulbert stated that he agrees with everything that has been said other than delaying it because there is no financial commitment of putting together a working group to look at their proposal and seeing if it can be tweaked. He noted their proposal doesn't necessarily mean they can't come up with a concept that in some way could engineer the project that there are locker rooms that can be used from Varsity all the way down to Termite and becomes something that the whole community can use. He added it's a 50 year old building and they do need to reinvest in it every once in a while and he would support moving this forward. He asked if we were to say "the concept of expanded lockers rooms" versus the "the concept of the Hornet's Nest" make the board more comfortable. Member Deeds responded the wording is fine with him; however, he just doesn't want to right now say he is supporting the concept of the Hornet's Nest as it stands. He would like to see what else needs to be done, he would like it to be a little broader and to be honest he doesn't know enough at this point.

Member Jones made a motion that they create a working group. Chair Hulbert made a motion to approve the concept of the expanded locker rooms at Braemar with potential new revenue sources to be studied in a working group with two or more Park Board members, members of the Drive for the Hive, staff and interested members of the public. Member Deeds suggested that they add "to request a representative from the School Board". Member Jones asked Chair Hulbert to repeat his motion.

Chair Hulbert made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, to approve the concept of expanded locker rooms at Braemar with potential new revenue sources to be studied in a working group of two or more Park Board members, members of the Drive for the Hive, staff, interested members of the public and school board representation. Member Dan Peterson seconded the motion.

Member Jones suggested an amendment to include a study of the needs of the arena; however, she doesn't want this to just be expanded locker rooms and potential revenue sources. Chair Hulbert replied that they have items in their CIP, are there things beyond that. Member Jones commented that in the notes Mr. Keprios has identified she would like the final report of the working group to address the things that deal with the facility needs. Chair Hulbert indicated that he thinks that the needs of the arena would be something that would be smart for this group to be looking at and not just throwing in varsity and junior varsity locker rooms. Member Jones stated that she thinks that is more consistent with the Park Board's mission.

Member Deeds asked what the wording of the amendment is. Member Jones replied "to include a Comprehensive Needs Assessment of Braemar Arena". Member Deeds seconded the motion.

Member Cella asked if they could amend the wording and say "School District representative" as opposed to "School Board representative" because it may be more appropriate depending on what the working group would be actually talking about to have the business manager or to have someone from the Athletic Department rather than someone from the School Board.

Mr. Keprios stated that you do have an amendment and a second and you need to vote on that amendment first and then you can offer a second amendment.

Chair Hulbert called for a vote on Member Jones' amendment to include a comprehensive needs assessment of Braemar Arena and the amendment carried.

Member Cella made a second amendment to the original motion to change it from a School Board representative to a School District representative so that they can have the people best capable of discussing the issues at the table.

Seconded by Member Jones

Motion carried

Chair Hulbert called for a vote on the original motion

Motion carried

Chair Hulbert asked the Park Board if anyone is interested in being a part of this working group to let Mr. Keprios know.

VII.B. Sport's Dome Presentation

Harvey Feldman, 9317 40 ½ Ave., No., New Hope, informed the Park Board he is representing Parks and Recreation Consultants. Ken Vraa, McGregor, Minnesota, informed the Park Board he is representing Ken Vraa Consulting. Mr. Vraa noted that he has teamed up with Mr. Feldman and Eric Blank, who was not able to attend this meeting.

Mr. Feldman and Mr. Vraa gave the Park Board a power point presentation of the Edina Sports Dome Financial Feasibility Study.

Member Jacobson asked if they build a new sports dome it's a turf field that can be used during the months when the dome has been taken down. Mr. Vraa replied that the turf would certainly be useable during the summer. Member Jacobson indicated that with regards to size it was noted it's for one large, overlay field with two smaller divisions. She asked if they looked at having one big field plus one small field with the overlap of people wanting the same hours. Also, how would you net out that one big field. Mr. Vraa responded that they did not look at what the three small fields option would be. He noted you still have the problem that you don't have enough usage hours to really make full use of it; however, your 40% usage would actually drop in the fall. He noted it's 100% net right now so you would then have this field that would be standing empty during October, November and December but you would also have to sell more hours to the outside group. He indicated the increased revenues would be approximately \$13,000 if you had another field but again that would just be for January, February and March. He stated you've increased your revenues by \$13,000, which is a good number; however, your numbers for turf and dome replacements are going to go up and that's going to get into that \$13,000 because your construction costs are going up as well. That is why they stuck with the two field scenario.

Member Jacobson asked from what has been shown is there an additional cost if there is a walking track around the side. Mr. Feldman replied no, there is obviously an increased cost simply because the facility is a little larger but they did not calculate it out if they reduced it. He added there would be some savings if you don't have a walking track.

Member Jones indicated that she was looking at a study that was done in 2010 through the School District of putting a dome over Kuhlman which would cost approximately 1.6 million dollars. She stated the dome being proposed is 5 million dollars and asked why there is such a difference in cost. Mr. Vraa replied he cannot answer that because he doesn't know how they got their numbers so he has no means to do a comparison. Mr. Feldman asked did they consider grading to which Member Jones replied the field is already there to which Mr. Feldman responded that right there you have taken out the cost of the turf. Member Jones asked if the City put in a turf field what would be the incremental costs for doming it. Mr. Vraa replied that is a question they would have to defer to someone else because until you have a site and know what the soil conditions are like, it could be a big range.

Member Jones asked if they could give them any estimates on the impact of the new facility in Eden Prairie; is that going to affect their soccer clubs that are saying that they are going to buy time from us. Mr. Feldman replied he thinks you have to ask the Edina Soccer Club that question. He explained that one of the ways he thinks you get to that is going through this process of asking what hours they are willing to purchase. He indicated they may not get the kind of hours they need or want and so they may end up looking elsewhere to get the hours to satisfy their parents and their kids. It's not an easy question to answer.

Member Jones stated now that the study has come out she knows the Edina Soccer Club is talking with the Edina Baseball Association and they are trying to figure out how to make it work. She noted they are wondering if they commit to shoulder time, if they could sell it, is that something you would recommend as they talk to staff, is that something they should be allowing. Mr. Vraa replied no because the question is if they don't sell those hours they will always get dumped back to the City because you don't have anything that binds them to that period of time other than honor and trust. He explained that the presidency and council changes and a commitment that may have been at one time no longer is important because something else may be more important. Mr. Vraa pointed out if those groups still want to try to make this happen then what they need to work on is getting people into this dome in October, November and December because those are the hours that need to get sold, those are key. He noted that generally speaking you will be able to sell those January, February and March hours to some other groups that are all of a sudden out there that will need to pick up an hour here or there. You need to sell a bunch of hours during October, November and December to make this happen.

Member Jones asked Mr. Feldman and Mr. Vraa that in their experience with other communities where people have been okay with their user fees going up in order to support a dome. Mr. Feldman responded they have toyed with that particular subject, because if you want the best result you would rather have the Edina people carrying the load for you and not having to worry about non-resident groups coming in. He noted one of the ways you could do that, although they don't know of anyone who has done this, is you could look at charging more for your prime time hours for Edina and keep it lower for the non-residents because you are trying to attract them. He pointed out with the idea of gas prices going to \$4.00 a gallon that is a real important question to ask because of the energy they save by not driving all over the Twin Cities metro area. He thinks it is something that ought to be explored. However, if people aren't willing to go along with paying higher fees then they are going to have to charge higher fees for participation in that particular league and end up falling back on the fees participant in general. Mr. Vraa pointed out that a rule of thumb that you don't want to lose is that it's more important to sell more hours than to increase the rate because you will always generate more and if you have to have staff working on something, don't have them working on a rate schedule to increase it but rather have them working on selling more time because that's where your money is.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked about shrinkage. She asked if multiple associations were looking at the same prime hours, did you throw that shrinkage away. Those were not counted in the numbers, correct? Mr. Vraa stated correct. Member Peterson stated there was no assumption about a certain percentage

being negotiated into another time. Mr. Vraa replied no, and the reason for that is when you only have so many teams and they are already on the field on Monday and Tuesday and then Wednesday. Then all of a sudden you want them to come back on Saturday. To get the committed hours, does that mean they are going to have to go on Saturday twice? He couldn't do that and that is why he felt it best to use the 820 number. If the organizations think that they still can switch groups and put more time on a Saturday, remember they already have time on Saturday. They are not likely to have two a day for those kids. Member Peterson stated in a large association you have different age groups and there might be the ability to pick up additional Saturday hours.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if they reached out to any adult groups. Mr. Vraa replied they did try to talk to some of the adult groups but for example the adult softball was not interested because they have such a good deal at Richfield. He noted that he does think there are opportunities to start some programming because it is clear there will be some hours but you need to keep in mind that it does take time to grow and develop programs. He also stated that in their management model they are taking 25% of the arena's manager time so that person is not going to have a lot of time to develop those programs so you would need to find a little bit different staffing model to make that happen.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if there were any inclusion of School District hours in Edina turf rental. Mr. Vraa explained the School District has really committed to sort of a dollar amount which translates into hours where he made the conversion and they are part of the 820 hours. He added that they are also part of the shrinkage because they are also looking for times that would go into 6:00, so there is an overlap with the high school as well.

Member Gieseke asked what the design of the dome is going to be like and is it financially feasible. He stated that maybe they should flip it around and say what's financially feasible because it frightens him with the competition and with people not honoring contracts and that could put the city into a situation we don't want to be in. He asked if there are other options where they could build this in phases and see what works. He stated that the shoulder season concerns him. Could we design the facility in phases which would require fewer hours to sell? Is such a design possible? Kathy Wallace, Architect 1282 Stanford Ave., St. Paul, replied to address the question of building the dome in phases there are a number of pieces that have to be done pretty much at the same time that you are building the turf field and it would be very challenging given the way that is done and given the way a turf field is drained to change the size of the footprint of the dome at some later point because you would need to tear up a lot in order to put it down. She noted that another thing they've seen is that there is enough interest in both the full field and two smaller fields and that's kind of the increment that's starting with a full soccer field, is really the base increment and then you go up in size from there. Therefore, phasing in would be very challenging for the inflated part of the dome, some of the other stuff such as parking or an accessory building may be possible to phase in.

Member Gieseke asked is it all feasible to have two equal sized domes and have one available six months and start the other one 12 weeks later. Ms. Wallace asked if we would want those domes be merged or would you want the space to be open inside? Member Gieseke replied that's an architectural question and he is not sure. Ms. Wallace replied that is probably a dome technology question which in some ways goes beyond architecture as well. You could have one dome or two domes and yes, you could have one open the whole time and one open up later but she doesn't think you could ever merge those two domes to have a single field supported by one dome.

Member Jones asked what size of a footprint would be needed for the dome size recommended. Ms. Wallace replied that it really depends on what your group has asked for because the width of a soccer field can vary. A typical good sized dome is 220 feet wide and somewhere between 360 and 400 feet long. Member Jones stated that in addition to that purpose of a dome if they were going to be put in a

turf field they would put a turf field the size of a soccer field maybe a little wider but now if they are thinking that five years down the road we want to leave it open to have a dome. Ms. Wallace replied that you need about 10 feet somewhere between 6 and 10 feet on either side just to allow for the cutoff of that dome sloping down to zero or depending where your curve is. In addition, you are typically required to have a 10 to 15 foot sometimes maybe 20 feet fire route around the entire dome sometimes it can be on three sides or fewer but that does mean you need to add another basically 40 feet both directions.

Chair Hulbert commented that he thinks the jest of one of the emails they received is that they are over complicating things. It doesn't need to be an enterprise it's as simple as blowing it up and taking it down. He asked is that an oversimplification because it seems to be. He indicated that at Minnetonka it looks like they took an existing field to do it. He asked if they have any idea what it would cost to retrofit. Ms. Wallace replied they were the architects for the dome for the Minnetonka field. She explained they did the dome at the same time they turfed their football field, they completely stripped everything inside the track and even had to cut the track to allow the duct work from the mechanical units to go onto the track and the track into the dome. It really wasn't done as a retrofit as much as a complete redo of the field. Chair Hulbert asked if she knew how much it cost to which she replied she doesn't but that it is smaller and would not allow for two full youth soccer fields. She thought the cost was substantial, not as much as 5 million dollars but a lot more than 1.6 million.

Chair Hulbert asked the consultants if they've seen a scenario like Eden Prairie and Edina where two facilities are competing with each other and if the dome were built at Braemar they would be within ¼ mile of each other. Is there a scenario where they could actually see downward pricing pressure on the hours? Mr. Vraa responded it can happen, just look at what is happening to the golf industry and the ice arena industry you are seeing cutthroats particularly in the shoulder seasons.

Member Deeds stated this is an operating income statement there is no payment of the initial five million dollars so on top of the costs if it's a 5 million dollar bond issue over 20 years that's \$250,000 a year in principal, not including interest which would be another \$150,000 essentially of interest payments. Therefore, if they talk about a cash flow scenario on top of what is shown there is another \$300,000 to \$400,000 of cash outflow that the city will have to deal with because it's not coming from the dome in any way, shape or form. Mr. Feldman replied that is correct. Member Deeds stated that he wanted to make sure everyone was clear on that. He indicated that he likes the conservative numbers and he likes what the consultants have asked them if they were looking at this best guess would they get an 85% recovery. Mr. Vraa asked in year one to which Member Deeds replied over a ten year average. Mr. Vraa replied they may be able to do it by year three. Member Deeds asked but that is purely on operating costs again that does not include interest or anything else to which Mr. Vraa replied that is correct. Member Deeds stated so we aren't fully over the sinking fund we get about 85% of it to which Mr. Vraa replied that he thinks that could happen.

Member Deeds indicated that the impact of the golf dome, although we actually don't have a golf dome right now, was not mentioned and asked the consultants in their estimation is it significant. Mr. Vraa stated they did drop that slide from the presentation but noted that clearly any of the revenues that the golf dome had achieved during the months of October, November and December would evaporate because in a sense you would want to say that you will not rent that out for any purpose so in a sense you are forcing people to use this dome. Member Deeds asked so there is a substitution effect to the tune of \$15,000 to \$20,000 to which Mr. Vraa replied he think they stated \$10,000 in the report.

Member Cella indicated because of the difficulty of renting the shoulder time if you were to only inflate the dome starting in December so that you are only up during the prime season would you lose much money in the time you could otherwise rent during the shoulder time that it makes it economically

unfeasible to make that choice or is it silly to build a dome when you are only going to be using it for three or four months. Mr. Vraa replied that is a tough question because putting a dome up in the middle of the winter becomes something of an issue because you will probably not get it done in December for \$35,000. He explained what is happening right now is the area domes have gotten together and there is an outfit that goes from one place to another and puts them all up because there is some efficiency for them to do it that way. Otherwise, you would have to bring in these people at a different time and the fee would go up. He stated that they would really have to take another hard look at that because he really doesn't have a clear answer.

Member Segreto indicated that it seems what they are trying to do tonight is decide whether or not to go forward with a second consulting report or should they hold off. She stated that the wisdom they received from the report is great but they really need to assess what the Edina usage is going to be in kind of a business plan and project it out. She noted they really don't have any idea what the demographics will be 10 or 15 years from now in terms of kids needing to use the dome. She commented that she thinks they need to do some more homework before they go ahead and do another report.

Member Dan Peterson asked does anyone build a permanent one in over 20 years to save money on energy. Mr. Feldman replied they are going to find out because Woodbury just announced they are going to build a 15.5 million dollar permanent building where it will be air conditioned in the summer and heated in the winter. He also noted that Vadnais Heights has a full dome that operates during the summer and is air conditioned so they are waiting to see what kind of costs are going to be involved in that. He added that he believes Woodbury is looking at having geothermal.

Member Dan Peterson asked did he understand correctly the end of the 6th year the School District is predicting less students. Mr. Vraa replied no, the School District's projections only go out five years so that is all they have to work with. He noted that he thinks they are going to be stable because Edina has got certain qualities and an air about them that you should always be able to have a stable population. Mr. Feldman pointed out that Edina is one of the highest rated quality of life indexes and it's because Edina is a place you want to live.

Member Dan Peterson asked if sprinklers are ever put in these domes. Ms. Wallace replied she is not aware of any that have sprinklers but she knows it has been studied because there is always discussion when you are looking at a dome and if they were to make it a seven or eight month dome at that point it falls under a different building code rather than regulated by the fire code. She indicated there has been some discussion of something like a water cannon but there is no way to suspend sprinklers from the air supported cable structure.

Paige Rickert, 5304 Forslin Dr., indicated that part of his concern is making these sweeping assumptions that you have exhausted who you have evaluated; soccer, lacrosse and baseball. He noted that the School District was a minor player at best in this analysis and primarily because they are not set up to accommodate dome use hours through registration fees. Mr. Rickert proposed to the Park Board that they put together a working group comprised of the youth association members, high school coaches for both boys and girls and some private citizens to be a part of the task force to help you figure out how many numbers are really in demand.

Jeff May, Edina Baseball Association, 5724 Dale Avenue, indicated that he has gone through the numbers and the hours committed multiple times to which he stands firmly behind the hours submitted. He suggested that several shoulder hours that were excluded from the study would be negotiated back into the useable and rental hours. He commented that the population of organizations has been limited to four and certainly they would be able to rent many more hours than that; however, they do appreciate

the conservative approach the consultants have taken on the study. He noted another question he would like to raise is the assumption that the entire facility would cost approximately 5 million dollars which would be a reasonable assumption if every possible location would be a similar cost. He commented that one of the Park Board members raised the question about Kuhlman and with such a significant difference in cost he thinks that's an option worth considering because it would be a shame to exclude options with such varying differences in cost if that could make the difference between what's feasible and what's not feasible.

Matt Meyer, 5708 Abbott Avenue, informed the Park Board that for that last few years he has been involved with youth flag football and they end up driving to Maple Grove just so they can play and it's an hour round trip. He indicated that he would like to have the shoulder hours looked at more because two years ago in October it was one of the rainiest seasons and approximately 45% of their games were canceled and they couldn't make them up. He stated that looking at the shoulder hours in October and even extending into November could extend the football season and a lot of those shoulder hours could be used for football. He indicated that there are groups out there that will use those shoulder hours and in a city like Edina they need to take pride in their facilities overall and he really thinks they can make it work.

Carter Freeman, 6144 Arctic Way, informed the Park Board he is the head coach of the Edina High School Baseball team and is also the assistant coaches on the Edina Legion Team which falls under Edina Baseball Association. He indicated that he thinks one thing that has not been addressed is that once a dome is in place that more programs will be built such as a Coach Academy or off season leagues. He noted that the hours that have been put down at this point probably represent what is but doesn't represent what could be. He pointed out on the high school side of things they are at huge disadvantage compared to other communities because they are not allowed on the baseball fields in Edina until April 15th so they need to get ready for the season on a gym floor or on an outside turf football field where the weather is always a question mark that time of year. He commented that he likes the idea of Mr. Rickert's idea of getting a task force together made up of different organizations and associations where they can make sure they get those shoulder hours covered. He asked that they be given the opportunity to sharpen their pencils and look at it more. He knows this has been something that has been looked at for many, many years and it's time for a city like Edina that values excellence they need this dome.

Chair Hulbert stated that he thinks it's clear that there is a need for multi-purpose athletic fields that can be used all year and feels it's important to adapt and offer amenities for the next generation of residents. He commented that he finds it a little bit frustrating when they hear that other domes are built with support from school districts and they are not seeing much of that at this point. He asked the consultant is there more evaluation that needs to be done of these organizations to sharpen the pencil and fine tune these hours and maybe there is something that was missed. He asked the consultants if they talked to the school's athletic organizations to which Mr. Feldman replied that they talked to Community Education but he thinks their recommendation speaks for itself. If you think you are going to go forward you ought to have a meeting with your staff and all of these Edina groups to see how many hours can be sold from their perspective and then after that has been determined to go to those non-Edina groups and find out what they are willing to buy. He added there is probably going to have to be some adjustments, as he indicated in the recommendations that Edina might have to give up some choice prime time to get some non-residents to come in.

Member Jones informed the Park Board that the committee did decide to go ahead with the recommendations by the consultants and what they would recommend to the Park Board to move forward with the recommendations that are on page 20. Chair Hulbert pointed out that he felt the recommendations of the committee differed a little bit from the recommendations of staff which to him

kind of felt like an either, or. He commented that he agrees with Member Segreto in that it definitely deserves to be studied a little bit further. Member Jones stated that it could be done different but the recommendations are talking about trying to flush out the hours that could be committed to. She noted that what they are hearing is that is something that the athletic associations want to do too, so she doesn't see that there is much of a conflict it's just in the process of how it's handled in whether or not it's going to go through a committee or working group, or at the staff center. Member Segreto stated that she thinks a working group is a good idea and suggested they also have someone from the School District to study usage and hours and demand.

Member Jacobson pointed out that one of the only other recommendations that the committee added to the list were to explore with the users if there are any other amenities they would want in addition that would make them use more hours or make them want to come to this dome versus a different dome, what would you like to see added that would make you or someone else want to use it more.

Member Deeds indicated that if continue on the with the study there is another piece to this and that is they are short on fields and for 5 million dollars of capital outlay for a dome field that's probably three non-domed turf fields which would be available for use eight or nine months out of a year. He noted they have limited resources and limited ability to fund these kinds of things which provide for the utility for the community. He stated one field dome or an alternative for example take Pamela Park and put in two or three more turf fields. Therefore, if they are going to move forward on this he feels that has to be part of the discussion because it's a very important consideration. He added they are extremely short of fields and one field isn't going to do it but would relieve it a little bit. Member Deeds pointed out that one domed field may make everybody happy between October and March but it does not solve the problem for the rest of the year and talking about trade-offs this needs to be part of that conversation.

Chair Hulbert asked if they should be considering trade-offs as a Parks Department. If they look at all of the needs of the community and in looking at the Needs Assessment Survey that was done in 2006 there are still a lot of wants and needs and it would be helpful to know if they can have all of these things, can they stagger these things. He commented if they were to in a few years say they want a recreation center will they be told no because they have five million dollars in revenue bonds on a sports dome so you can't have it even if it's what the community wants. That may need to be part of it too. Member Jones suggested they put that discussion on the agenda with the City Council because she feels as if that's where they are circling back to the same concept of how should they approach these multiple needs and issues. Chair Hulbert replied he would like that and he would also like for there to be a dome but wonders if they are being the best stewards for the community ten years down the road if that's not the greatest need. Member Jones proposed that they put the comprehensive needs question on the agenda for the March meeting and for the dome she would recommend that they go ahead with the recommendation set forth here and form a working group. Member Steel indicated that she would also like to know what all of the athletic association's wants and needs are before they go to the City Council. Member Deeds replied that they already attempted to survey them and the data has all been put together. Ms. Kattreh replied she will get the results of that survey to the Park Board.

Member Jones indicated that she wants to make sure that if she proposes to have another working group for the Park Board that there would be a sufficient supply of Park Board members willing to be on it. She commented that the recommendation from the committee was nearly that this would be a staff run facilitated meeting with the associations in order to flush out these numbers. She asked the Park Board if they felt this should be a working group or should it be more like the recommendation which is staff led. Member Steel commented that Mr. Keprios has a lot of things on his plate right now and asked if that would be possible. Mr. Keprios replied that yes there are a number of things on our plate right now when you count up the number of working groups, studies, issues, etc. He informed the Park Board that when it comes down to it his own bias is the question before you tonight is to define feasibility. In the

end, we will need to define what is feasible regardless of how many more hours they are going to ask staff and volunteers to study. As the consultants stated earlier, at the end of the day these are not hours that you can go to the bank with even if they sign something in a legal contract because there may be a day when they won't honor that contract and there is not much the city can do about it. He explained that what it comes back to is it really good use of volunteer and staff time. What is before the Park Board is to wrestle with the real issue, do you want to bite the bullet and is this important enough for the community to have this amenity based on all of the studies that they have to date including the needs assessment survey and quality of life survey as well as what they have learned from the studies from the other enterprise facilities that have been done and are currently ongoing. Mr. Keprios indicated that he thinks the Park Board has a very keen understanding of what the needs are and thinks it's going to come down to your judgment call. He noted that clearly the numbers are showing that it's not going to pay for capital costs of principal and interest. He stated that they could do some more homework and could probably get more people to commit to more hours and come back with 1,000 hours; however, you still don't have the dollars to build it.

Mr. Keprios indicated that he would like for the Park Board to express how they feel about this and is it important enough and desired to have this amenity in the community. There can be a lot of arguments made that this is what makes "Edina" Edina and it's time to do it regardless and he thinks that is what the City Council wants to hear from the Park Board. What is your advice and what do you feel that your neighbors are telling you rather than further delay a decision and study it some more because you will be right back here with the same issue in front of you and how do you feel about it, that is going to be the bottom line.

Member Segreto stated that ultimately she does not think they have the money to build this dome and they will need to bring it to a referendum and the voters will ultimately decide. She indicated that she thinks the City Council was a catalyst to getting this before the Park Board today by commissioning the first study and she does sort of agree with Mr. Keprios that they could use this amenity in the community; however, with that being said she feels it is for the residents of the City of Edina to decide whether or not they are willing to pay for it.

Member Deeds noted that cash flow wise it's going to cost essentially \$300,000 a year out of the city coffers for the sports dome by the time you talk about pay back of principal and interest and that is without a sinking fund figured in. He stated that yes, he thinks they need it and would use it but at that price the only thing he can't answer is for \$300,000 a year how many turf fields could they get because that to him is the alternative because they are short on fields and is it worth one dome. What is the trade-off between a dome and turf fields so that we have more facilities for the rest of the year. Member Deeds asked Mr. Keprios if it would be possible for staff to do a quick calculation of what is they are looking at in terms of cost for turf fields and where they might be able to put them. He noted that things like turf fields and adding lights solve a lot of problems and granted it doesn't give them that late fall and winter indoor time but there are a lot of domes going up around too. Therefore, he is fully in support of the fact that they need more athletic fields but the question is do they need a dome or do they need turf fields. Mr. Keprios replied he can come up in fairly short order what it would cost to put artificial turf on existing fields.

Mr. Keprios pointed out that as Member Steel had pointed out earlier the bigger issue is there are other wish lists out there, such as the Edina Baseball Association did a wonderful job coming forward with a very detailed wish list and priority that is approximately 2.1 million dollars. He stated that once you get everything and put it all on the table there are going to be some decisions and priorities to make.

Member Jones indicated that she understands they need to improve the arena and the playing fields. She noted they have listened to the number of other communities that have domes; however, they have paid

for a consultant and since they've gone this far she wants to make sure that they've done all they can in order to try to make this work and she doesn't want to say the number is too big. She commented there are a lot of people in Edina that if they said they might be able to build a dome maybe they would find some private donors for the capital expense. She asked how they will know without a capital campaign that they might not have donors willing to put up front money to build a turf field and/or put up the dome. She stated that she would still propose that they look into this by doing something similar to the Hornet's Nest and put together a working group and try to make this happen for Edina.

Member Deeds indicated he has done the numbers and the bottom line if this happens is the City is going to have to commit substantial annual revenue to this dome. He noted there is not a study you are going to be able to do that shows that this will pencil out. He stated it's an amenity that the city is going to have to bite the bullet on and provide and that's what they have to figure out. He commented whether it's the dome or fields their amenities in general need substantially more investment than we are currently putting in. He informed the Park Board he is in favor of doing something along these lines but he doesn't want any surprises and he doesn't want anyone to be thinking there is any way you are going to make these numbers work because they are not going to work. It's his guess that it's going to cost the City \$300,000 a year to run and so they need to make the decision with their heads up and honestly facing what the numbers look like.

Member Steel stated that she is hesitant to set up any working group until they have a discussion with the City Council and feels it would be timely to talk about this at the March meeting. Member Jones stated that then she would suggest that they go with the recommendations of the consultants.

Member Deeds suggested they go with the consultant's first two recommendations between now and the City Council meeting. He asked would the clubs and associations be able to work the pencil on the hours and get out a calendar and see how it would fill out with the soccer club and baseball association and other key programs they've talked about and see if there is an actual interest. Is that something that would be feasible for staff to take on to which Mr. Keprios replied they can do that but some other things may not get done. He informed the Park Board that this is on the City Council's retreat agenda coming up this weekend. One of the important issues with all of the Boards and Commissions is prioritizing the work load because there is only so much staff and this much work load and every meeting there is another new high priority that needs to get done right away and therefore something has to give. He stated that it wouldn't be his recommendation but staff is never going to say "no". Member Cella asked if that would include Member Deed's suggestion of getting some comparable figures on what 5 million dollars would buy in terms of other turf fields. Member Deeds responded that he is actually more interested in that the first two recommendations from the consultants. Mr. Keprios responded that he is happy to get the figures on the artificial turf but does feel he needs to volunteer one thing. He informed the Park Board that they tried very hard through the Master Plan Development Process that was very public and very transparent with the Pamela Park neighborhood to get artificial turf into the complex and that concept failed because the neighbors would not hear of it. That is why the Master Plan at Pamela Park shows a renovation over the large lighted field and it shows an installation of a new development of a new soccer field that's going to be grass with sand peat state of the art and that is a major reason why they haven't gone to artificial turf. So that's another whole battle to fight because even if they have the money, it will be difficult to have it survive the public and political process.

Chair Hulbert asked has there been any communication with the people at the new dome in Eden Prairie about Edina clubs or associations securing hours at that facility, could they have discussions with them to try to secure those prime time hours because he would think they are going to want to sell them. Member Kathryn Peterson replied she would think they would want to sell them but they wouldn't necessarily have any guidelines about preference for Edina associations.

Member Jones indicated that they are basing this off of a 5 million dollar estimate for a dome and she doesn't know why this other estimate from 2010 is so much lower and feels they should try to figure that out because they could possibly do a dome and three fields for 5 million dollars she doesn't know. Member Deeds responded that will get them into the site selection process because he doesn't think you are going to be able to pin down the cost of the dome until you look at all of the relative costs of the different sites.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board there are really only two locations in Edina where it could clearly be done for less than 5 million dollars and they are both on school property; one is at the high school and other one is at Community Center campus. He noted that staff has been working this issue for 15 years and did support and propose to have it done at Kuhlman and went through the process; however, the neighbors got organized and killed it. He indicated that he doesn't know if much has changed since then so now that leaves you one other option and he would venture to guess it's the same thing and that would be to put a dome but on a much smaller field at the high school. He explained that it would give high school kids easier access to it which makes a lot of sense but as far as the money goes he thinks those are the only two options where it is going to cost substantially less than 5 million dollars. Member Deeds noted that the neighbors are already organized and attended all of the sports dome sub-committee meetings, so it's not going to be an easy one.

Chair Hulbert asked the Park Board if they would like to table this discussion until their meeting with the City Council in March. Mr. Keprios replied he is not 100% certain Park Board has a meeting with the City Council in March. He noted there is a work session of the City Council on March 20th but it hasn't been determined whether the Park Board will be a part of that or not. He indicated that depending on the decision made tonight that may change and if you really want to have a joint session with the City Council that recommendation should be made tonight. He stated the City Council is talking of having the Sports Domes and Edinborough Park study on their March 20th work session agenda.

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Steel that the Park Board request that the City Council allow the Park Board to participate in their work session regarding the Edinborough Park Study and the Sports Dome.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Segreto, Cella, Deeds, Hulbert, Gieseke, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson. Motion carried.

Member Deeds made a motion, with the additional information Mr. Keprios is going to give to them on the alternative fields that this goes back on the agenda for their meeting on March 13th for hopefully a discussion that will lead to a vote one way or the other on what they want to do about this or at least whether or not they want to continue to move forward.

Member Jones stated that she just wants to offer if staff does not have time to talk with the associations there seems to be interest from them to be able to meet that she would be happy to meet with them and it could be a very short term working group to try to meet with them before this next Park Board meeting. Member Gieseke volunteered to work as well on the working group.

Chair Hulbert asked are we creating a work group here now.

Member Deeds stated that he is on the current one and asked if the current one is done.

Mr. Keprios stated that you already have a Sports Dome Working Group now that is familiar with the topic so why are they not the go to group. Chair Hulbert stated they should have the existing work group for the Sports Dome continue and if he is interested in joining we can do that.

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Chair Hulbert, that Member Gieseke is appointed on the committee.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Segreto, Cella, Deeds, Hulbert, Gieseke, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson. Motion carried.

VII.C. Appointment to Community Education Services Board

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that Bill Lough is now off the board; therefore, they have a vacancy on the Community Education Services Board. Chair Hulbert asked the members to look at their calendars and look at the obligation and if you're interested to let Mr. Keprios know.

VII.D. Adopt Park Board Bylaws

Chair Hulbert informed the Park Board that Member Jones has passed along a couple of amendments to the Park Board Bylaws and asked her to explain those.

--Page 2. Bottom of page. Quorum

Proposed new section:

Remove (6 or more) from first sentence.

Proposed first sentence: A simple majority of the voting members constitute a quorum for any regular or special meeting.

Member Jones explained the reason she is suggesting this is because their board changes in size when someone is rolling off or has resigned and before the City Council is able to appoint a new member so there may be a majority of all seated members but it would not be six necessarily. Therefore, she would just take that out and it would be a simple majority of the voting members. Mr. Keprios replied that he wishes it could be that way but he did have a discussion with the City Attorney on that language and the Park Board by City Code is a 12 member board two of which are non-voting and in order to have a quorum until these bylaws pass you have to have six because even if you have someone who moves or resigns mid-stream and all of a sudden you only have nine voting members present by law it shows that you still have to live by that number 6. He noted that just because they are not there doesn't change the number on the Park Board, it's as if they are absent. Member Jones replied that is exactly why she is proposing to take out that number six because she doesn't think it has anything to do with a legal issue but rather how they want to operate as a board, they are creating their bylaws. She indicated that the City Code may say they have so many members but it also says that a number of other things that what we are trying to do is that the voting members if there is no open, what she is thinking about is it has to do with an open seat, open seats are no longer voting members. Mr. Keprios replied that an open seat is just a seat that is temporarily not filled yet the requirement to have six doesn't change is what the City Attorney is telling him. Member Jones asked can she make a motion that if it passes legal we will take out the six. Chair Hulbert commented that he thinks the one thing they are trying to do here is have uniform bylaws for all of the boards and commissions and maybe this is something they should be running past the City Manager's office so that there isn't one offset of bylaws here that the other boards have. Member Jones asked if all of the other boards have 12 members. Chair Hulbert replied that he believes the Planning Commission does to which Member Jones replied these bylaws are not with the Planning Commission. Mr. Keprios noted that the Art Center Board has the exact same number as the Park Board but he can certainly ask the question.

Member Jones proposed all of these changes to go through legal first before they pass and she would assume that is the process that will happen anyway.

Remove If a quorum is not achieved within 15 minutes of the start of the meeting"

Proposed second sentence:

No votes may be taken if a quorum is not established or maintained.

Mr. Keprios asked Member Jones what she would prefer to have instead if a quorum is not achieved within 15 minutes of the start of the meeting. Member Jones stated that the proposed second sentence then is “no votes may be taken if a quorum is not established or maintained”. She is not sure what that 15 minutes at the start of the meeting means because if they decided to have a meeting and then somebody comes in at 17 minutes after the meeting then are they saying that they can’t vote. Mr. Keprios replied okay.

Page 3 Meeting Agenda last sentence in paragraph

Change Friday to Wednesday

Member Jones stated that she would change that the meeting agenda and related materials be sent electronically and mailed as of the Wednesday prior to the scheduled meeting because quite frankly she finds that it is very difficult to get through her packet in the number of days that she has so she would just be proposing that they get it on Wednesday.

Page 5 bottom of page Committees: Insert after “established”

A temporary Committee Chair will be appointed by the Park Board at the time of Committee information.

Member Jones explained that this is talking about forming committees and she would request that they add a sentence there that would allow them to have a chair, a temporary chair before the committee meets and elects their permanent chair. She pointed out her reasoning is because you need somebody to call the first meeting and they kind of came into this a little bit with the dome because they didn’t know who was going to be chair or when they were going to meet so she would like to add the sentence “a temporary committee chair will be appointed by the Park Board at the time of committee formation”. She would just insert that one little sentence and that clears that up.

Chair Hulbert asked Mr. Keprios if he would review these with the City Attorney to which Mr. Keprios replied he would do that and the Park Board can vote on them after.

Mr. Keprios reminded the Park Board that in his staff report he is asking that Park Board recommend to the City Council that they grandfather in the Veterans Memorial Committee in its current structure because if the bylaws pass then it doesn’t meet that requirement.

Member Daniel Peterson made a motion to adopt that.

Member Jones stated that she would agree that right now that is working fine but she would like to have a time limit on that because right now that would mean that importunity the same people are working on this. She commented that they are doing a wonderful job so she doesn’t want to really mean anything by this but she does think that these bylaws are talking about kind of limited times for certain committees and she does think that they should put a time on this. Chair Hulbert asked Member Jones what she would propose to which she replied she doesn’t know. Mr. Keprios asked Member Jones if she means a time limit on any committee to which Member Jones replied they are talking about just the Veterans Memorial Committee. Chair Hulbert suggested how about if they state upon completion. Member Jones replied that she wants a time, it could be two years; it’s going to be done before two years. Mr. Keprios replied he doesn’t know that it will. Member Gieseke asked Member Jones why she is looking for a time. Member Jones explained the reason why working groups and committees are included is that the city is recommending that all of them have voices on boards is because it’s important that what they are doing is open and transparent. She noted she is just suggesting that she wouldn’t want to set up in their bylaws a committee importunity that doesn’t have any numbers that have the same type of requirements. She stated that she is suggesting that that seems as if it’s a huge exception and it doesn’t need to be, if just seems as if they are making an exception in their bylaws for a group that is going to

probably not be around for more than two years and she doesn't think that that's a good idea. Mr. Keprios replied that he is not suggesting there be a change in the bylaws to accommodate this committee but just to ask the City Council to grandfather in this one exception. He indicated if for example you were to put a time limit on it for a year from now, at that time are you then going to have a new Park Board member serve on the committee and take over as chair. Member Jones stated that she thinks that would be appropriate but she would say two years from now because that would give them plenty of time to do the work. She noted they've done a wonderful job and if there is follow-up and more needs to be done on the project then she thinks it is no longer part of what they initially suggested their mission was which was to design and create. Mr. Keprios commented that if you turn back the clock on more than one occasion the Park Board was asked to provide a liaison to serve on the committee and it was decided back then that we will let Mike Goergen serve as the chair in which he has done a good job and has put in hundreds of hours and to tell him now if they don't get it done by a certain time you are not going to be chair anymore. Member Jones replied she would recommend that he be co-chair because that goes with the bylaws. She pointed out that she is just saying there is no reason really to make an exception, a total exception and just say an ongoing working group without any member on Park Board she is uncomfortable with that. Member Dan Peterson replied that he is not at all uncomfortable and thinks Mr. Keprios proposal is a good one and the group is doing a very good job and let them get it done. Chair Hulbert stated that he agrees.

Chair Hulbert indicated there is a motion to approve the bylaws with Member Jones proposed changes and to approve the grandfather exception for the Veterans Memorial group. Member Segreto commented that she thought they were going to run them by legal counsel first. Chair Hulbert stated that he thought they were going to let legal counsel take a look at them after. Mr. Keprios replied they can still make a recommendation and the motion and they will find out whether legal counsel or administration can accept that. Chair Hulbert stated that he would put that forward as a motion.

Ayes: Peterson, Segreto, Cella, Deeds, Hulbert, Gieseke, Peterson, Steel, Jacobson.
Motion carried.

VII.E. Park Board Self-Assessment Proposal – Louise Segreto, Edina Park Board

Member Segreto informed the Park Board that she has been serving on this board for two years and over her course of tenure on this board they've had some really great meetings and some that could be greater. She stated that as a whole they have had some really talented people both on the board and on staff. She noted that every board she has served on, all have been non-profit they have always had a regularly occurring self-assessment. She explained that if you look at board self-assessments to which she could rattle off a half dozen standard questions that non-profit boards use on a regularly basis usually every two to three years but is not quite sure what would be appropriate for this group. She stated that she thinks they could do a better job of what they are doing if they take a moment to self-reflect and go through the process. She indicated that she asked Mr. Keprios if they could possibly get a facilitator because it makes it so much easier when you have a neutral party going through the process; however, from what she understands they don't have the luxury of doing that. She noted that she thinks this would cause them to be more effective. She pointed out there are a lot of non-profit aids out there on the web and she would like to draft one up and send it to the chairperson and Mr. Keprios and solicit the Park Board comments because she is sure they could come up with maybe two pages worth of self-assessment questions. She stated they could then figure out a process of going through this in a relaxed setting and not at a meeting. She commented they can get to know one another better and to make meetings more effective and see how they are relating to one another, how they are relating to staff and does every board member feel like they can contribute or is the some overshadowing going on that they need to work on as well as many other issues that most board do consider but her thought is to really make this experience better.

Chair Hulbert indicated that he thinks it's a great suggestion.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked Member Segreto if she envisions there being a survey that they each would complete and there would be a facilitated discussion, she's not really sure how it would work. Member Segreto explained she would take a survey from a non-profit guidance company and it would be put in a Park Board packet which will incorporate input from anyone on the Park Board what they would like to see added. The survey would be filled out and signed and she doesn't think it should be an anonymous survey. Then they would need to somehow come up with a process to compile and summarize the surveys, maybe the chairperson, and then meet at an offsite premise and have a meaningful discussion about where they would need improvement, what is working well, what's not working well, and what could they do to make things better.

Member Steel indicated that she thinks this a great idea and hopes that it will be successful so that other boards and commissions use it down the road. She added there is a lot to gain from this process and so she is grateful that Member Segreto brought this forward.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if they could assume that this would be a nonpublic meeting to which Mr. Keprios replied all Park Board meetings are open to the public. The only thing that the law permits for a closed meeting is if it deals with a legal or personnel issue. Member Deeds suggested that they take this discussion offline and don't do it as a Park Board and if they want to do something like this they just do it as private individuals. Mr. Keprios replied that was okay so long as you are not conducting serial meetings through emails which is in violation of the open meeting law. He stated that you certainly can do things on your own. Member Steel asked could the chair set up an on-line survey and then the members respond and them. Mr. Keprios replied absolutely, you just can't engage in sharing ideas, thoughts and what not in an email conversation with all members.

Chair Hulbert indicated that since this is Member Segreto's idea he is assuming she will take the leadership role in setting up this survey. Member Segreto replied yes but said she still needs to do some more research on it.

VII.F. Donations Policy & Naming of Parks and Facilities Policy Working Group Update

Member Jones informed the Park Board there are no updates at this time.

VII.G. User Fee Policy Working Group Update – Keeya Steel, Vice Chair Edina Park Board

Member Steel indicated that they have focused on youth athletic associations and divided up the different areas to per participant user fee residency requirement, financial reporting requirements and tournament policy. On Sunday, as she previously mentioned, the working group met with the athletic associations and they had a great dialog on the different pressures that the associations are facing and about how we want to see Edina and these athletic associations succeed going forward. She stated that she was happy to find out that the athletic associations generally agreed with the direction of their working group's recommendations as well as they did gain some insight from them. She added that they will continue to meet twice a month until they nail down a recommendation.

VII.H. Election of Officers

Mr. Keprios opened up the floor for nominations for Chair of the Park Board. Member Hulbert made a motion to nominate Keeya Steel. Member Segreto made a motion to close nominations. Member Dan Peterson seconded the motion. Motion carried and Mr. Keprios announced that Keeya Steel has been voted as Chair of the Park Board.

Mr. Keprios opened up the floor for nominations for Vice-Chair of the Park Board. Member Kathryn Peterson made a motion to nominate Ellen Jones. Member Segreto made a motion to nominated David

Deeds. Member Deeds had to respectfully decline given his travel schedule. Member Deeds moved to close nominations. Joseph Hulbert seconded the motion. Motion carried and Mr. Keprios announced that Ellen Jones has been voted as Vice-Chair of the Park Board.

VIII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that he doesn't have any correspondence and petitions to hand out although he has been collecting approximately 40 to 60 emails a day on the golf dome, sports dome and Edinborough Park. He noted that he is trying to accumulate those and continue to update each master list and send them out in one email.

IX. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Jones indicated that next month Highlands Park is going to be on the agenda where the Edina Soccer Club is asking the City to remove the softball field and asked what the process is for public notification. Mr. Keprios responded that he will send out a mailing to everyone who lives within 1,000 feet of Highlands Park informing them of what the proposal is, that will be on the agenda. He stated that the letter will encourage residents to express their views by email, postal mail or show up at the March Park Board meeting and give public testimony.

Member Hulbert stated that they have received a lot of emails and some of them were saying that Edina is falling behind but that they also need to look at Edina because it has a lot of things in their community that a lot of other communities don't such as a golf course and Edinborough Park which is a unique facility. There are a lot of things to be proud of. He noted that he took his son ice skating the ice was totally skateable where a lot of other communities have given up even trying to maintain their ice so kudos to the staff, there are lot of people who appreciate staff still maintaining the effort.

Member Jones asked about the golf dome to which Mr. Keprios replied that the cause of the fire is still under investigation. He noted that they are researching what it would cost to bring it back to the original condition. He added that they do have insurance and thankfully for them it is a total replacement cost insurance so it's well over one million dollars and that is just for the fabric.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked what if that insurance money was used toward a replacement of the golf dome that maybe had two parts; one that was a golf part and one that was an athletic field part. Mr. Keprios noted that is something that they are going to have to spend some time giving some thought to, but it likely won't be enough to get the whole job done. Member Deeds pointed out that they did have a discussion regarding that at one of their sports dome subcommittees and the fact is that golf and other athletic uses don't mix because of the very nature of it so it is two completely separate facilities. Member Kathryn Peterson stated but it could be two domes next to each other with a common building, they could take advantage of that. Member Deeds stated you could pick a common building and share a parking lot. Mr. Keprios responded that is a concept that is being considered and in fact that concept was considered before the golf dome went down.

Member Gieseke indicated that they understand there is a great demand and they would love to see a dome. He noted that he thinks there is something they are missing, some ingenuity that maybe has to do with the fire and rebuilding of the dome or something where they can make this work. He noted that is why he was asking if they could do it and open it in stages as well as have more mixed use so there are different revenue streams to make this work. Mr. Keprios replied that there would be some economies to having a shared building but it's going to require a new location and that adds to the cost significantly but believes that it's something that should be considered.

X. STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Keprios noted he just wants to thank Ms. Kattreh for all of her work as she has been pulling a lot of extra duty and wearing a lot of hats covering for Edinborough, being his new Assistant Director and serving on working groups. She has really done a stellar job with all of that and thank you.

Mr. Keprios indicated that they are just ecstatic to have Susan Faus join their team. She is very sharp and a great professional.

Mr. Keprios noted that he also wants to give kudos to his maintenance staff for the outdoor ice rinks. He thinks they are probably one of a few communities that has been open as much as they have.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm